



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,228	06/26/2003	Susan T. Dumais	MS160341.1 / MSFTP392US	5890
27195	7590	04/07/2006	EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/607,228

Applicant(s)

DUMAIS ET AL.

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28,30-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 30-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-28,30-57 pending in this application.
2. Claims 1,28,35-36 have been amended [1/26/2006].
3. Claim 29 has been cancelled [1/26/2006].

***Drawings***

4. The Drawings filed on 6/26/2003 are acceptable for examination purpose.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The information disclosure statement filed on 10/11/2005,12/05/2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy is enclosed with this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. ***Claim 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhodes, US Pub. No. 2003/0028631 filed on July 31, 2001, published on Feb 6, 2003 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hansen et al. [hereafter Hansen], US Pub. No. 2003/0014399 filed on March 12, 2002, published on Jan 16, 2003***

8. As to claim 1, Rhodes teaches a system which including 'a usage analyzer that determines user accessed items and a content analyzer that stores subsets data corresponding to the items, at least two of the items being associated with disparate sources' [page 3, col 2, 0037, page 4, col 1, 0045, fig 1], user accessed items and content analyzer corresponds to Rhodes's fig 1, user ID as detailed in fig 4-5];

'an indexing component that indexes the data subsets' [page 5, col 2, 0058, fig 9], indexes the data subsets corresponds to Rhodes's fig 9, element 202 index array.

It is noted that Rhodes does not specifically teach 'sparse representation o the subset', although Rhodes specifically teaches network usage analysis system also including query as detailed in fig 1. On the other hand, Hansen et al disclosed 'sparse representation o the subset' [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 1-4, 0050, line 8-9, col 2, line 1], Hansen specifically teaches search result including search session , as detailed in page 5, col 1, 0049.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Hansen et al. into network usage analysis system and method for updating statistical models of Rhodes because both Rhodes, Hansen both directed to internet, more specifically Rhodes is directed to usage analysis system as detailed in fig 1, while Hansen also directed to monitoring search, search path and search session using proxy log because proxy log including IP address associated with proxy user, a time stamp and logged event and requested web page [see Hansen: page 5, col 2, 0052] and both teach usage of internet data, particularly statistical analysis using statistical model [see Rhodes: fig 1, element 34; Hansen: fig 6, element 622, page 7, col 1, 0073]..

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Hansen et al. into network usage analysis system and method for updating statistical models of Rhodes because that would have allowed users of Rhodes to not only search and access required web pages but also tracks users search session by the proxy log subset that including IP address, time stamp and associated event and like [see Hansen: page 5, col 2, 0052], thus improving monitoring user search activity and reusability as suggested by Hansen [page 3, col 2, 0026].

Art Unit: 2166

9. As to claim 2, Rhodes disclosed 'search component that in response to a search query, initiates a search across the indexed data' [page 4, col 1, 0045]. It is noted that Rhodes does not specifically teach 'outputs links to locations of a subset and/or sparse representation o the subset', although Rhodes specifically teaches network usage analysis system also including query as detailed in fig 1. On the other hand, Hansen et al disclosed outputs links to locations of a subset and/or sparse representation o the subset' page 5, col 1, 0049, line 1-4, 0050, line 8-9, col 2, line 1], Hansen specifically teaches search result including search session , as detailed in page 5, col 1, 0049.

10. As to claim 3, Hansen disclosed 'local or remote data locations including files, folders, applications, images, audio files, appointments, email, and web information' page 3, col 1, 0020-0021,page 4, col 2, 0043], Hansen specifically teaches "yahoo" supports all the features for example files, folders, applications, images [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 5-6], audio files, appointments, emails and like.

11. As to claim 4, Hansen disclosed 'filter that extracts portions of the accessed items and creates sparse representations of accessed data in a content index' [page 5, col 1, 0045, line 1-4].

12. As to claim 5, Hansen disclosed 'indexer associates metadata with the accessed items, the metadata employed to retrieve the accessed items' [page 3, col 1, 0018].

Art Unit: 2166

13. As to claim 6, Hansen disclosed 'metadata includes at least one of a file path, a hyperlink and a tag' [page 5, col 1, 0050, line 4-9].

14. As to claim 7, Hansen disclosed 'an implicit query that is derived from the search query' [page 5, col 1, 0045, line 1-4].

15. As to claim 8, Hansen disclosed 'a gatherer component that specifies an interface to different content sources in their native format' [page 6, col 1, 0060].

16. As to claim 9-10, Hansen disclosed 'filter decodes individual file formats and emits a character stream for further processing' [page 6, col 1, 0062, line 1-5].

17. As to claim 11, Hansen disclosed 'processing includes at least one of date normalization and stemming' [page 5, col 2, 0052, line 4-6].

18. As to claim 12, Hansen disclosed 'query language for accessing stored information' [page 6, col 2, 0065, line 9-13].

19. As to claim 13, Hansen disclosed 'retriever component provides Boolean functions and best match retrieval on full text and metadata properties that enable at least one of phrase, wildcard and proximity searches' [page 5, col 2, 0050, line 1-5].

20. As to claim 14-15, Hansen disclosed 'protocol handler to extract individual messages from exchange mail stores, local mail files and public folders' page 5, 0050].

21. As to claim 16-17, Hansen disclosed 'event component that monitors user and makes determinations with respect to user actions' [page 5, col 2, 0052].

22. As to claim 18, Hansen evidential patterns of user activity including at least one of: a focus of attention, an introspection, an undesired piece of information, and a domain-specific syntactic and semantic content' [page 5, 0048, 0052].

23. As to claim 19-21, Hansen disclosed 'implicit queries based upon potential interest to a user' [page 5, col 2, 0053].

24. As to claim 22, Hansen disclosed 'uses to share selected electronic files with other users' [page 9, col 1, 0110].

25. As to claim 23, Hansen disclosed 'remove accessed ifnroamtin items' [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 8-13].



Art Unit: 2166

26. As to claim 24, both Rhodes, Hansen do not specifically disclose 'calendar items' It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have calendar items during user submits search query because that would allowed users of Rhodes, Hansen specifically select calendar feature for example date, day and time to execute the search using search engines, thus able to maintain log in the proxy server and user session.

27. As to claim 25, Hansen disclosed 'perform background storage operations to processes volatile data' [page 3, col 2, 0028].

28. As to claim 26, Hansen disclosed, 'usage analyzer and the indexer is executed on at least one of a client machine and a server machine, the client and sever machines including at least one computer respectively' [see fig 7-8].

29. As to claim 27, Rhodes disclosed 'computer readable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for implementing at least one of the usage analyzer and an indexer' [page 9, col 2, line 23-25].

**30. Claim 28,30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Egendorf et al. [hereafter Egendorf], US Pub.No. 2003/0177111 A1 filed on Jan 21, 2003 [having continuation of application No. 09/441,270 filed on Nov 16, 1999], published on Sept 18, 2003 in view of Singer et al. [hereafter Singer], US Patent NO. 6789115**

31. As to claim 28, Egendorf teaches a system which including 'concurrent searching across a plurality of sources' [fig 1, Abstract];

'automatically determining whether a user has contemplated a data source selected from at least two disparate data sources' [page 7, col 2, 0092, line 8-11, 0094, line 9-16, page 11, col 2, 0156, line 12-14], data sources corresponds to Egendorf's information sources fig 1, element 11A-11N;

'automatically indexing the contemplated data source in a computerized index' [page 12, col 2, 0175, fig 10]. It is however, noted that Egendorf does not specifically tech 'automatically monitoring the user and automatically analyzing the data source to determine whether the use has contemplated the data source', although Egendorf disclosed user searching multiple data sources as detailed in fig , Abstract. On the other hand, automatically monitoring the user and automatically analyzing the data source to determine whether the use has contemplated the data source' [Abstract, fig 1-2,col 4, line 30-67].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Singer et al. into searching from a plurality of data sources of Egendorf et al. because both Singer and Egendorf are directed to accessing, querying network, more specifically, Egendorf is directed to identifying multiple information sources, and retrieving information from information sources [see Abstract, fig 1], while Singer is directed to capturing, analyzing, storing, reporting user's usage of multiple web servers from Internet [see Abstract], both Egendorf, Singer teach Internet information sources [Egendorf: fig 1; Singer: fig 1], further both Egendorf and Singer teach querying [Egendorf: page 12, col 1, 0166; Singer: col 6, line 5-6].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Singer et al. into searching from a plurality of data sources of Egendorf et al. because that would have allowed users of Egendorf to incorporate collection of user usage data from internet, more specifically, filtering program for user to track "log records" that automatically collects, captures and analyzes from multiple internet or web servers on daily or time of day set for the process, thus bringing the advantages of minimizing the use of system resources, automatically deleting unwanted information and increasing efficiency of system resources as suggested by Singer [col 2, line 11-14, line 47-48].

32. As to claim 30, Egendorf disclosed 'at least one of explicit query options and implicit query options to access the computerized index' [page 12, 0176-0177].

33. As to claim 31, Egendor disclosed 'automatically updating a metadata file associated with the data source with at least one of explicit tag information and implicit tag information' [page 12, col 2, 0174, 0180, fig 3A-3B].

34. As to claim 32, Egendor disclosed 'file sharing option [page 12, col 2, 0173], a file scrubbing option , an effective time computation, and a background storage option' [page 8, col 2, 0099, line 18-21, page 9, col 2, 0111], file scrubbing allows to locate specific item of interest for example allows to jump specific portions in the screen graphics, audio, video with respect to control signals or timeline .

35. As to claim 33, Egendor disclosed 'automatically filtering the data source to create a sparse representation of the data source' [page 10, col 2, 0144, line 9-15].

36. As to claim 34, Egendor disclosed 'displaying at least one of a timeline visualization and grid visualization to represent queries derived from the computerized index' [page 11, col 1, 0148-0150, fig 3A-3B].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

37. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

***38. Claims 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Grefenstette et al. [hereafter Grefenstette], US Patent No. 6446035 Published on Sept 3, 2002.***

39. As to claim 35, Grefenstette teaches a system which including 'means for determining when a user has accessed an information item' col 8, line 7-13, col 10, line 13-17, fig 5, element 306, fig 6, element 360], Grefenstette specifically teaches user ID, URL for the accessed web page including time stamp that indicating when particular user accessed information;

'means for filtering the information item' [col 13, line 28-36], filtering the information item corresponds to user entering the query using selected fields and query in field as detailed in fig 6;

'means for storing subsets of data corresponding to the information item and sparse representations of the subsets' [col 11, line 3-11, col 12, line 61-67], Grefenstette specifically teaches storing the database entries particularly tables and related data that including subsets of data and sparse representations of the subsets as detailed in fig 4, element 274, 276,278;

'means for indexing the subsets of data and sparse representations of the subsets in a content index' [col 10, line 4-12,col 12, line 58-64, fig 5, element 330,332, and 334], Grefenstette specifically teaches indexing web pages corresponds to indexing information item;

'means for querying the content index' [col 13, line 37-39].

**40. Claims 36-57 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Raboczi et al. [hereafter Roboczi], US Pub.No. 2003/0061209 filed on April 26, 2002, and published on March 27, 2003.**

41. As to claim 36, Raboczi teaches a system which including 'a user interface for Computerized searching of data '[page 1, col 1, 0002], Raboczi directed to user interface for navigation of information or searching information as detailed in page 1, 0002;

'a display having one or more display objects representing results gathered from monitoring information items previously observed by a user' [page 2, 0024, page 3, col 2, 0046, page 4, col 1, 0058, line 14-18, page 4, col 2, 0067, page 5, col 1, 0069 fig 2-3]; Raboczi specifically teaches user searching information related to document metadata and list of links to related to documents are displayed as detailed in fig 2-3, further , Raboczi also teaches automatically capturing , displaying activity information items where user can select or deselect information as detailed in page 5, col 1, 0069.

'at least one input option associated with the display to facilitate user queries of the information items' [fig 5, page 5, col 2, 0084], Raboczi teaches search may be narrowed or refined by specifying for example date range selection group element 88, further this group includes two text boxes element 90 and 92 or text box 94 may be used to enter dates that corresponds to at least one input option associated with the display to facilitate user queries.

42. As to claim 37, Raboczi disclosed 'queries are launched when filtering objects in the user interface are manipulated or when the user selects return' [page 5, col 2, 0087, page 6, col 1, 0089, line 3-5].

43. As to claim 38, Raboczi disclosed 'a list view interface' [page 5, col 2, 0089], Raboczi specifically teaches hierarchical menu control element 130.

44. As to claim 39, Raboczi disclosed 'a preview showing a portion of a message' [page 5, col 2, 0087, line 4-7].

45. As to claim 40, Raboczi disclosed 'at least one of a document title, a date, a rank, an author, mail to field, a file type field, a mail CC field, a mail has attachment field, a message type, a message read field, a path, a size and a title' [page 2, col 2, 0027, line 5-8, page 5, col 1, 0069, page 6, col 1, fig 7, 0092].

46. As to claim 41, Raboczi disclosed 'display objects further comprise user selectable filters' [page 5, col 1, 0071].

47. As to claim 42, Raboczi disclosed 'options for adding custom metadata to items' [page 5, col 1, 0072, 0077, fig 4].

48. As to claim 43, Raboczi disclosed 'options to supply usage-based metadata that is generated from user events' [page 5, col 2, 0079].

49. As to claim 44, Raboczi disclosed 'a persistent query that is associated with a local or remote content source, and summary information presented to the user relating to the query' [page 3, col 1, 0045-0046, 0052].

50. As to claim 45, 47, Raboczi disclosed 'display further comprising a timeline visualization of the display objects' [page 3, col 2, 0049, fig 3 page 5, 0082].

51. As to claim 46, Raboczi disclosed 'timeline visualization includes an annotation of at least one of a public event and a personal event to facilitate searching results-related information' [page 5, col 1, 0068, col 2, 0082].



Art Unit: 2166

52. As to claim 48, Raboczi disclosed 'grid visualization enables users to explore trends, correlations, and relationships in a large information set' [page 4, col 2, 0064, 0067].

53. As to claim 49, Raboczi disclosed 'visualization employs a grid motif to show relationships between attributes of people, topics, and time, wherein uses assign one of the attributes to an X axis and another attribute to a Y axis' [page 4, 0068, page 6, col 2, 0106].

54. As to claim 50-51, Raboczi disclosed 'present information about items that have been accessed by multiple people in an organization, shared via the merging of multiple indices or via the indexing of coalesced content' [page 6, 0108, fig 9A-9C].

55. As to claim 52, Raboczi disclosed 'virtual folders that contain results of predefined, or persistent queries, including queries that have, as part of their definition, temporal or organizational relationships' [page 3, col 1, 0046].

56. As to claim 53, Raboczi disclosed 'a hierarchy of nested sets of folders of increasing specialization that are invoked to represent the results of queries with increasingly specialization' [page 3, col 2, 0047, page 6, col 2, 0106].

Art Unit: 2166

57. As to claim 54, Raboczi disclosed 'a component to submit a query or an automatically reformulated version of the query to at least one other search engine' [page 1, col 2, 0013].

58. As to claim 55,-57, Raboczi disclosed 'a component for accessing resources from the internet [page 3, col 1, 0045, line 8-10], and integrating query results from a personal search engine with results from the other search engine in a displayed result list' [page 5, 0069].

### ***Response to Arguments***

59. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/26/2006 with respect to claims 1-28,30-57 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiners' response see the discussion below:

a) At page 9, claim 1, applicant argues that claim 1 recites a system that facilitates concurrent searching across a plurality of sources, comprising: a usage analyzer that determines user accessed items and a content analyzer that stores subsets of data corresponding to the items ....., Rhodes does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention .

As to the above argument [a], as best understood by the examiner, firstly, Rhodes is directed to usage analysis of network, more specifically, analyzing stream of network related data that including data collection and data analysis [see fig 1, page 3, col 1, 0035]; secondly, Rhodes specifically teaches "statistical model" that is used not only "interactive statistical analysis", but also allows to update the real-time stream of record events with respect to usage of data for example rolling time interval of subsets of data, probability distributions and like [page 3, col 1, 0036]. It is however, noted that Rhodes does not specifically disclose "sparse representation of the subset", although "subset of data records" are integral part of data collection, data analysis of network usage data of Rhodes [see fig 1]. On the other hand, Hansen et al teaches 'sparse representation o the subset' [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 1-4, 0050, line 8-9, col 2, line 1], Hansen specifically teaches search result including search session , as detailed in page 5, col 1, 0049. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Hansen et al. into network usage analysis of Rhodes because both Rhodes, Hansen specifically directed to data collection, data analysis, monitoring overall activities [see Rhodes: fig 1; Hansen: fig 6], both Rhodes, and Hansen particularly teaches "statistical analysis" using statistical model [Rhodes: fig 1, element 34; Hansen: fig 6, element 622, page 7, col 1, 0073]

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Hansen et al. into network usage analysis system and method for updating statistical models of Rhodes because that would have allowed

users of Rhodes to not only search and access required web pages but also tracks users search session by the proxy log subset that including IP address, time stamp and associated event and like [see Hansen: page 5, col 2, 0052], thus improving monitoring user search activity and reusability as suggested by Hansen [page 3, col 2, 0026].

b) At page 10, claim 1, applicant argues that Rhodes defines network usage information as metadata information about the communication sessions and does not include the actual information exchanged in a communication session.....whereas the present invention discloses a content analyzer that creates.....

As to the above argument [b], as best understood by the examiner, Rhodes discussing the problem[s] related to network usage information, particularly “network usage information does not include the actual information exchanged in a communication session between parties [Rhodes: page 1, col 1, 0004, line 1-4] in the “background of the invention”, further examiner direct the applicant’s attention, how “Rhodes” solving the problem of “network usage analysis” particularly using “statistical models” in real-time [page 2, col 1, 0015], and importance of such “statistical models” usage in network usage analysis in the entire disclosure. It is further noted that Rhodes specifically suggests not only indexing of data records, but also mapping index to the various index segments that specifically represents least recent, and most recent record events with respect to time intervals [page 5, col 2, 0058], therefore, Rhodes teaches content analyzer that creates, analyses array of event data records in real-time.

c) At page 10, claim 1, applicant argues that “further, the system includes one or more disparate information sources that are accessed or considered by a user, having dissimilar information content, whereby some of the information sources may represent local data locations such as files, folders, applications, images, audio files, appointments, email, and so forth, and other sources may represent remote sources such as web information, for example [see page 6, line 13-20]. Rhodes is directed to an updatable.....Thus, Rhodes is silent with regard to a content analyzer that stores subsets of data corresponding.....disparate sources

As to the above argument [c], applicant's interpretation of the prior art is noted. However, the claim limitation reads, “a usage analyzer that determines user accessed items and a content analyzer that stores subsets data corresponding to the items.....indexing component that indexes the data subsets”. In response to applicant's argument that the Rhodes is silent with regard to a content analyzer that stores subsets of data corresponding.....disparate sources

(i.e., “further, the system includes one or more disparate information sources that are accessed or considered by a user, having dissimilar information content, whereby some of the information sources may represent local data locations such as files, folders, applications, images, audio files, appointments, email, and so forth, and other sources may represent remote sources such as web information, .....”) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

Art Unit: 2166

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). This is not a suggestion of any sort.

As explained in the above rejection, and from the Rhodes reference, Rhodes specifically teaches analyzing a stream of network data related to set of event records, particularly, network usage analysis system that using “statistical models” in real-time capability of update statistical models over a rolling time intervals [see Abstract, page 3, col 1, 0035, fig 1]. It is also noted that Rhodes specifically suggests not only indexing of data records, but also mapping index to the various index segments that specifically represents least recent, and most recent record events with respect to time intervals [page 5, col 2, 0058], therefore, Rhodes teaches content analyzer that creates, analyses array of event data records in real-time. On the other hand, Hansen et al disclosed ‘sparse representation o the subset’ [page 5, col 1, 0049, line 1-4, 0050, line 8-9, col 2, line 1], Hansen specifically teaches search result including search session , as detailed in page 5, col 1, 0049.

Examiner applies above discussed arguments to the dependent claims 2-27.

d) At page 12, claim 28,30-34, applicant argues that present invention discloses concurrent searching across a plurality of sources, wherein user activities are monitored and events relating to when information has been accessed.....user are recorded...accordingly, the method of Egnedorf et al. does not monitor or record events

Art Unit: 2166

relating to what information has been accessed or seen. Thus, Egendorf et al. is silent with regard to automatically monitoring a user and automatically analyzing a data source.....data source.

As to the above argument [d], as best understood by the examiner, Egendorf is directed to searching multiple data sources, more specifically, search base identifies various data sources [[fig 1], query is automatically generated identifying information sources [page 5, col 1, 0054], further information sources may be financial, travel, laws, regulations, library or any other collection of information, these information sources associated with multiple categories for searching or querying [see page 5, col 1, 0056-0057], It is also noted that these categories are being indexed from various information sources for example, and cross-references or linked that allows accessing both static and dynamic information sources as detailed in page 5, col 2, 0060.

It is however, noted that Egendorf does not specifically tech 'automatically monitoring the user and automatically analyzing the data source to determine whether the use has contemplated the data source', although Egendorf disclosed user searching multiple data sources as detailed in fig, Abstract. On the other hand, automatically monitoring the user and automatically analyzing the data source to determine whether the use has contemplated the data source' [Abstract, fig 1-2, col 4, line 30-67].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Singer et al. into searching from a plurality of data sources of Egendorf et al. because both Singer and Egendorf are directed to accessing, querying network, more specifically, Egendorf is directed to identifying multiple information sources, and retrieving information from information sources [see Abstract, fig 1], while Singer is directed to capturing, analyzing, storing, reporting user's usage of multiple web servers from Internet [see Abstract], both Egendorf, Singer teach Internet information sources [Egendorf: fig 1; Singer: fig 1], further both Egendorf and Singer teach querying [Egendorf: page 12, col 1, 0166; Singer: col 6, line 5-6].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Singer et al. into searching from a plurality of data sources of Egendorf et al. because that would have allowed users of Egendorf to incorporate collection of user usage data from internet, more specifically, filtering program for user to track "log records" that automatically collects, captures and analyzes from multiple internet or web servers on daily or time of day set for the process, thus bringing the advantages of minimizing the use of system resources, automatically deleting unwanted information and increasing efficiency of system resources as suggested by Singer [col 2, line 11-14, line 47-48].



e) At page 12-13, claim 35, applicant argues that the present invention discloses a means for storing subsets of data corresponding to the information item and sparse representation of the subsets. For example, if the user has accessed a web page, the content analyzer may create a thumbnail representation of the web page and associate a hyperlink reference to the page and thumbnail [spec page 6, line 13-20].....accordingly, Grefenstette et al. does not store subsets or sparse representations of the data. Thus, Grefenstette et al. is silent with regard to a means for storing subsets of data corresponding to the information item and sparse representations of the subsets.

As to the above argument [e], applicant's interpretation of the prior art is noted. However, the claim limitation reads "means for determining when a user has.....means for filtering...means for storing subsets of data corresponding to .....means for indexing the subsets of data.....means for querying the content index". In response to applicant's argument that the Grefenstette et al. is silent with regard to a means for storing subsets of data corresponding to the information item and sparse representations of the subsets (i.e., "if the user has accessed a web page, the content analyzer may create a thumbnail representation of the web page and associate a hyperlink reference to the page and thumbnail, .....") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). This is not a suggestion of any sort.

As explained in the above rejection, and from the Grefenstette's reference, Grefenstette's specifically teaches the limitation[s]'means for storing subsets of data corresponding to the information item and sparse representations of the subsets' [col 11, line 3-11, col 12, line 61-67], Grefenstette specifically teaches storing the database entries particularly tables and related data that including subsets of data and sparse representations of the subsets as detailed in fig 4, element 274, 276,278.

f) At page 14, claims 36-57, applicant argues that Raboczi et al. is silent with regard to a user interface comprising a display having one or more display objects representing results gathered from monitoring information items previously observed by a user.

As to the above argument [f], as best understood by the examiner, Raboczi specifically teaches user searching information related to document metadata and list of links to related to documents are displayed as detailed in fig 2-3, further, Raboczi also teaches automatically capturing , displaying activity information items where user can select or deselect information as detailed in [page 2, 0024, page 3, col 2, 0046, page 4, col 1, 0058, line 14-18, page 4, col 2, 0067, page 5, col 1, 0069 , fig 2-3]

***Conclusion***

**The prior art made of record**

- |    |                |              |
|----|----------------|--------------|
| a. | US Pub. No.    | 2003/0061209 |
| b. | US Pub.No.     | 2003/0177111 |
| c. | US Patent No.  | 6789115      |
| d. | US Pub.No.     | 2003/0028631 |
| e. | US Pub.No.     | 2003/0014399 |
| f. | U.S.Patent No. | 6446035      |


**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc  
Patent Examiner.  
March 27, 2006.

  
SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER